DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 957 IR 054 517

AUTHOR McGuire, Mark J.
TITLE An Exploratory Study of Cathedral Music Libraries.
PUB DATE Nov 92
NOTE 83p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Churches; Classification; Indexes; Information Needs; Library Catalogs; Library Materials; Library Networks; *Library Services; Library Surveys; Library Technical Processes; Mail Surveys; *Music; *User Needs (Information)
IDENTIFIERS Cathedrals; *Music Libraries; *Roman Catholic Church

ABSTRACT

A survey was mailed to the 185 U.S. Roman Catholic cathedrals to determine the nature and extent of cathedral music libraries. In addition to baseline demographic information, survey questions focused on the following topics: (1) music library staffing and management; (2) methods of cataloging and classification; (3) the use and creation of indexes and other finding aids to the collection; and (4) interest in information sharing and networking. Based on a 61 percent usable return rate, results indicate that Roman Catholic cathedrals maintain music libraries ranging from 160 to 90,000 scores, use a wide range of cataloging and classification systems, and have developed an assortment of custom indexes to these collections. No cathedral music library is managed by a professional librarian. Eighty-eight percent of music directors value the introduction of standard library practices to cathedral music collections, but only 57 percent expressed a desire for professional assistance. Cathedral music directors expressed a decided interest in developing a shared information network, but indicated a lack of resources to achieve this end. Twenty-two tables present survey responses. The questionnaire, its cover letter, and a follow-up letter are included. (Contains 37 references.) (Author/SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED355957

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF CATHEDRAL MUSIC LIBRARIES

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library and Information
Science in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

Mark J. McGuire

November, 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark McGuire

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

A survey was mailed to the 185 U.S. Roman Catholic cathedrals to determine the nature and extent of cathedral music libraries. In addition to baseline demographic information, survey questions focused on 1) music library staffing and management; 2) methods of cataloging and classification; 3) the use and creation of indexes and other finding aids to the collection; and 4) interest in information sharing and networking.

Based on a 61 percent usable return rate, results indicated that Roman Catholic cathedrals maintain music libraries ranging from 160 to 90,000 scores; use a wide range of cataloging and classification systems, and have developed an assortment of custom indexes to these collections. No cathedral music library is managed by a professional librarian.

Eighty-eight percent of music directors value the introduction of standard library practices to cathedral music collections, but only 57 percent expressed a desire for professional assistance. Cathedral music directors expressed a decided interest in developing a shared information network, but indicated a lack of resources to achieve this end.

Master's Research Paper by

Mark J. McGuire

B.A.E., The Ohio State University, 1978

B.F.A., The Ohio State University, 1978

M.A., The Ohio State University, 1986

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1992

Approved by

Advisor_____Date_____

Table of Contents

List of Tables iv

Introduction 1

Literature Review 3

Objectives 26

Definitions 28

Methodology 31

Findings 34

Summary and Implications 58

Reference List 64

Appendix A: Reference Sources Cited by Cathedral Music Directors 67

Appendix B: Correspondence and Survey Instrument 68

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Parish Size by Quartile	36
2.	Diocesan Size by Quartile	37
3.	Number of Scores in Cathedral Music Libraries by Quartile	38
4.	Collection Size by Choir Size	39
5.	Number of Titles in Cathedral Music Libraries by Quartile	40
6.	Number of Titles by Choir Size	40
7.	Number of Titles by Diocesan Size	41
8.	Total Collection by Diocesan Size	41
9.	Annual Music Budget by Choir Size	42
10.	Matrix of Financial Support Indicators	43
11.	Music Librarian by Size of Choir	44
12.	Catalog System by Music Librarian	46
13.	Matrix Showing Catalog, Acquisitions, and Size of Cathedral Music Collections	
14.	Library Catalog by Budget	47
15.	Library Catalog by Budget	48
16.	Cathedral Music Libraries Reporting Use of Authorized Headings - by Catalog and Librarian	49
17.	Filing System by Catalog Type	50
18.	Indexes Reported by Type of Catalog	52
19.	Rank Order of Cathedral Music Library Indexes	53
20.	Value of Indexes by Director Tenure	54
21.	Attitude Toward a Cathedral Music Library Catalog by Current Type of Catalog in Use	55
22.	Attitude Toward Catalog Assistance by Music Librarian	56

Introduction

Despite the presence of a large professional alliance of music librarians and a highly codified system for organizing and retrieving music materials, for various reasons, printed music, and particularly church music has remained "fugitive" due to accident, intent, or neglect. The earliest organists and choirmasters, the first caretakers of church music, rarely thought their service music and anthems as worthy of preservation (Young, 1989). Music was subject to changes in taste, and its physical, printed form was often held by musicians with indifference compared to the actual performance.

It was not until the mid-nineteenth century that printed music became the norm in cathedral choirs, and cathedral music directors were admonished to establish libraries of the best music, arranged for subsequent retrieval, and protected from neglect (Gauntlett, 1989). The methods for identification, organization and preservation were left to each director to invent or discover. Typically, both then as now, these fugitive materials have not been cataloged, classified, and indexed according to "standard library practices." Rather they have received minimal attention, most commonly being filed alphabetically by title or composer.

Though music librarianship provides well-established standards for description and access of music materials, the vast majority of church music libraries reside outside of

traditional librarianship, and have developed without benefit of standardized practices. Usually no professional librarian is present, and extraction of relevant guidelines from the considerable literature of music librarianship by musicians or volunteers presents a monumental task.

Several distinctions separate the cathedral music library from the public or academic music library. First, the overriding mission of the cathedral music library is to support the planning, rehearsal, and performance requirements of the music director and choir--it is not necessarily established for browsing, research, or reference (though a well organized collection will serve these functions as well). Second, the cathedral music library serves a limited, homogeneous user group with clearly defined needs and known preferences. Third, where academic and public music libraries will provide books, scores, recordings, and other media, the cathedral music library will focus almost exclusively on printed scores.

There is little documentation of practices in cathedral music libraries; indeed, there is little published information about the special needs of any performance music library. Aside from large symphony choruses, where a trained librarian may be present, the largest number of choral music libraries operate within the realm of churches and schools, where no professional librarian is present; yet virtually no

training is offered to students of choral music direction in maintenance of music libraries. Most texts instruct future directors to file alphabetically, to assign consecutive accession numbers, or to shift the responsibility of the music library to a volunteer. As music collections grow, so too do the efforts required to manage and use these collections. Retrieval becomes burdensome and time-consuming in poorly organized collections; resources may be wasted on re-acquiring materials already in the collection, but filed by alternate title, or otherwise irretrievable; unnecessary effort may be required to learn each new system encountered. Despite the lack of documentation regarding the organization and maintenance of church and cathedral music libraries, it is clear that these libraries have existed and functioned for over a century. The purpose of this study is to assess current practices for organizing cathedral music libraries and to measure the level of interest of these libraries in developing alliances or networks which encourage standardization and facilitate information-sharing.

Literature Review

A careful examination of the Music Index, Repertoire International de Litterature Musicale (RILM), Library Literature, ERIC/CIJE, and LISA, reveals only a handful of citatations related to the management, cataloging, classification,

indexing, and/or automation of collections of musical scores. Obviously, narrowing the search further by seeking information specific to performance libraries or church/ cathedral music libraries produces an even smaller set of citations. This seeming lack of activity is probably explained again by the fact that most choral music libraries exist outside of the traditional library environment. Professional music librarians addressing these issues are generally working within the already established, codified library system, where needs, research, and publication goals are different from those of the performing library. Similarly the musicians who are operating cathedral music libraries have, generally speaking, more pressing publishing interests other than "how they file their music."

To understand the development and current state of cathedral music libraries, it is necessary to review briefly, the evolution of printed church music and its subsequent gathering together into "libraries." Also relevant are a basic understanding of music librarianship, as well as a review of the few studies more directly targeting printed scores, church music and church librarianship.

Church Music and Church Libraries

Church music as we know it, can be traced back to the formational years of the early Christians; to the singing of

psalms and hymns. (Of course, psalms and hymns had their roots in the Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, and Jewish traditions which preceded them.) Most forms of church music defy precise definition; psalms are musical settings of psalm texts taken directly from the Bible, and hymns can be defined as choral settings of poems or songs of praise, thanks, or devotion, intended for congregational singing. By the third century, rites and liturgies were formalized, and plainsong, or chant, developed to aid in recalling and enunciating texts. Chant is defined by its unison voice--there is no part-singing or harmonization. Each of these forms--psalm, hymn, and chant--constituted an oral tradition, as musical notation was not in use in Europe until the eleventh century. The earliest form of part-singing, called organum, was first described in a musical treatise Musica Enchiriadis in the ninth century (Johnson, 1983).

By the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, individual composers began to emerge, writing music for harmonic singing by small choirs of eight to twenty singers. This form of music, the motet, is defined as a part-song of up to four parts, using varied rhythms, based on sacred text, and intended for use in a church (Sadie, 1980). Composers such as Palestrina, diLasso, Victoria, Tallis, and Byrd rose to prominence by the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Martin Luther was encouraging congregational hymn singing, but also

promoted the trained choir for its role in worship. During the baroque period--roughly 1600-1750--composers such as Mozart, Bach, Handel, and Shutz emerged, as did several new forms of church music: the cantata, a short, dramatic setting with soloists and chorus; the oratorio, described as a full opera based on sacred text; and the anthem, a choral setting of sacred texts, in English, emerged as the dominant choral form, as a reaction against Rome (Rice, 1964). The anthem continues to be a mainstay of cathedral choir repertoire to the present day.

Around 1700, it was "accepted procedure" that portions of the religious service be provided by well-trained choirs, and by mid-century these singers expected more challenging music than the hymns and psalms of the congregation. Choirs worked from autograph copies or from hand-copied manuscripts. "It should be noted that almost all music written prior to the early nineteenth century was either commissioned for a special event or composed as part of the musician's regular job, the latter made necessary by the lack of printed music.... As a general rule, selections were repeated two or three times and then put away indefinitely" (Rice, 1964, p.44). Printed psalm and hymn books were available as early as the sixteenth century, but these often contained the text only, as melodies were often familiar and well-known. About this time, individual printed songsheets began to emerge in

England. The octavo, the standard (roughly 6" x 9") "sheet music" form of choral music today, was an outgrowth of these songsheets. It is possible that this simple form, which resembled printed ephemera more than printed books, contributed to the casual treatment of church music materials (Krummel, 1975). As musicology slowly developed into a respected academic discipline, the more serious care of music materials followed. Preservation of cathedral music manuscript collections was begun and the holdings of cathedral music libraries were more systematically inventoried.

One of the first catalogs of a cathedral music library, A Catalogue of all the Songe-bookes for the performance of Divine Service: appertaining to the Cathedral Church of the Holy Trinitie in Chichester, is dated January 18, 1621 (Young, 1989). Though none of the 18 titles or 141 items survives, the catalog documents the efforts of a seventeenth century choir director to organize and inventory his choral music collection. Numerous other cathedral choirmasters cataloged their music collections (Canterbury in 1742, Exeter in 1752, and Lichfield in 1786) but music "...continued to be largely ignored by the learned librarians" (Young, 1989, p. 257). Attention paid to works about music was directed to critical or academic studies, not to the scores. In 1833, the "Oxford Movement" began, ushered in by a sermon delivered at Oxford, which called for a revival of the Church of England,

to include liturgical renewal as well as improved church management. Respected clergymen and "vicars choral" began systematically cataloging and preserving cathedral music libraries, and exhorting others to do as well:

> The music Books.--The care of the choir-books, a matter of great importance, is generally assigned to the precentor [director].... allow no music-books to be kept in the quire. Remove the whole collection into a suitable room in the cathedral. Appoint four or six of the boys to be bookclerks, allowing them a little salary for their services. Let these young librarians arrange the books in the quire previously to each service. Thus the condition of the books will always be known (Jebb, 1989, p. 259).

It might be believed that the literature of church librarianship would include advice and prototypes for the storage and retrieval of music materials, but the research fails to support this notion. The earliest churches did indeed maintain libraries, often kept in the sacristies along with church vessels and vestments. Paulinus of Nola, in the sixth century had a library attached to his basilica (Weiner, 1980). Through the dark ages and into the 15th century churches and monasteries remained one of the strongholds of learning and libraries. During the renaissance and after the Reformation, monasteries and their libraries closed, and advances in secular knowledge eclipsed the religious.

Music has, since the beginning of the church, held a somewhat uneasy position because of its secular associations (instrumental music is to this day denounced by certain

denominations). The earliest church leaders were concerned about music's pagan roots--with its associations with dancing and revelry. In 1324, Pope John XXII only reluctantly allowed certain kinds of part-singing, to preserve the solemnity of chant and to guard against music's intrusion into the mass (Johnson, 1983). The complete elimination of polyphonic music was considered at the Council of Trent (1545-1563), due to the blurring that had occurred between sacred and secular music (Rice, 1964). Because of this oftentimes uncomfortable relationship between the church and music, and because the study of music as a serious academic pursuit did not occur until the nineteenth century, music in cathedral or church libraries is virtually unheard of--its care and maintenance has almost always resided with the musician, not the librarian.

Relative to the history of the church and of church music, church librarianship has a much shorter history, tracing its origin back only 40 or 50 years. (Monastery, seminary, and theology school libraries have a longer history, but their mission and clientele are defined differently than those of the church library.) Harvey (1980) indicated that church librarianship is in the earliest stages of self-development, having been largely ignored by state and national library associations. He notes there is a dearth of substantial literature, a lack of research, and training of

church librarians is carried out mostly through one-day conferences and workshops. Perhaps most significant for this study is the virtual absence of any mention of musical materials in the available literature about church librarianship, confirming the long-standing tradition that these materials are generally not managed by professional librarians. In the first national Directory of Church and Synagogue Libraries, none of the 3,200 respondents indicated service to the church music program as one of their primary responsibilities (Rodda and Harvey, 1967). Further efforts to define church libraries rarely include musical scores as part of the library collection (recordings and other media are mentioned, but these are usually specifically indicated as educational, not performance materials). In a 1975 survey to identify and define church library services, collections, and management, none of the more than 1,800 respondents indicated responsibility for the church music collection (White, 1980). One handbook, How to Administer and Promote a Church Media Library (Anderson, 1984) proposes an organizational chart with a church library professional staff of 18 individuals, an amazingly large number in a field clearly dominated by libraries staffed by one or two unpaid, non-professional volunteers! Included in those 18 positions is a music librarian, with specified job duties of acquisition, cataloging, and filing church music, and otherwise supporting the church

music director and church music program. Anderson appears to be a lone voice offering guidance to church music libarians. Two other publications by this author are Developing a Church Music Library (1982), and How to Catalog Church Music Materials (1976). Both of these small handbooks appear to be addressed to volunteer librarians, offering practical advice for recording acquisitions, typing catalog cards, maintaining files, and monitoring circulation.

Music Librarianship

Concerning music librarianship, there is a more recent and extensive history of publication. While the first music libraries in the United States date from the mid-1860s, modern music librarianship is said to have begun in 1904, when Oscar Sonneck published the Library of Congress classification schedule for music. By 1919, eighty-seven music libraries were identified by the U.S. Bureau of Education (Bradley, 1990). In 1931 the Music Library Association was formed. Due in large part to this professional body there is a vast literature in music librarianship concerning standards for the description and access of music materials. An overview of this body of knowledge is necessary in order to identify where the cathedral music library may diverge.

On the need for the music catalog, Smiraglia (1985) contends that there are three functions common to all

catalogs: 1) identifying or finding a particular item, 2) collocating, or arranging like things together, and 3) evaluation or selection, which permits the user to select one item from among many. Buth (1975) suggested that one measure of a well organized collection is the frequency with which a patron can bypass the catalog altogether and go directly to the shelves. It is this notion of "catalog bypass" that typically governs the development of special collections such as performance music libraries. The primary patron is the music director, who relies on memory or a simple alphabetic filing system to store and retrieve materials. Eventually, it becomes apparent that a more complete, indexed catalog of the music library will better serve the needs of the organization, in addition to providing a valuable source of musical and bibliographic information. Unfortunately, it is the unanticipated growth and future demands on the collection that are not considered during the early stages of library devel-opment--a few pieces of music in a filing cabinet seems manageable. It is when those few pieces become thousands that the problem is realized, and retrospective "catching up" is required. Redfern may have contributed to this mindset and lack of visionary thinking when he stated:

> If the library will function properly without a catalogue, then one need not be provided....if all enquiries for scores use the name of the composer as search term and the scores are arranged alphabetically by composer, there is little point in providing a catalogue arranged by form (1978, p. 12).

To the contrary, provision of "generally accepted" access points to the collection, from its inception (within the limits that time, money, and knowledge will allow), would indicate a greater responsibility to the materials and to future users of the collection.

Horner (1973) identified nineteen potential cataloging problems common to nearly all special, non-book materials. Of these, the following seem to be particularly apparent when working with printed music: 1) special subject knowledge may be needed, 2) special reference materials may be needed, 3) information may be difficult to obtain due to lack of title page, 4) intellectual responsibility may be more diffuse, making it difficult to name an author-equivalent, 5) information in the document may contradict itself, and 6) internal indexes frequently need to be developed to better match the stock.

Perhaps the most difficult task in cataloging music is determination of title. Smiraglia noted that music "...is not linked to any particular linguistic tradition..." so materials appear in numerous languages much more frequently than do more typical library materials (1989, p. 164). Often, to musicians, the language is insignificant, or the native

language is preferred to the vernacular. Added to this seemingly simple matter of translation is the fact that composers often use varying titles for the same work, and further, music publishers may re-title a musical work for marketing reasons, or because the work in hand is a variant or reduced manifestation of the original. For this reason, the uniform title has become singularly important in music cataloging.

Although they are not required for the majority of the scores in the cathedral music library, the value of uniform titles should not be underestimated. Most church anthems and hymns have distinctive titles composed by one individual. Generally speaking, these works are treated like other textual material--entered under composer, with an added entry for title and arranger (if required). Other liturgical works, however, (masses, requiems, magnificats, oratorios), often fall into that category of "serious" music with "generic" titles that require a uniform title to collocate and distinguish.

Musical scores are cataloged using essentially the same rules as other materials, yet they distinguish themselves from other texts in several ways. These distinctions are noted in chapters five and twenty-five of Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, second edition (usually called AACR2). The notable differences that set music cataloging apart from more

"typical" cataloging are inclusion of the publisher's number(s) and/or plate number(s) in a note, since it is this information that often serves in the place of the standard number (a small minority of music publishers use ISBNs, and the ISMN--International Standard Music Number--is only in the first stages of implementation by the International Organization for Standardization), and the somewhat more common use of the uniform title.

While cataloging music is much like cataloging any other printed matter, frequently the rules for music differ from those for other text. Where music cataloging diverges from other monograph cataloging, official Library of Congress Rule Interpretations are issued quarterly through the Cataloging Service Bulletin. Music Cataloging Decisions (clarifications of LC practices) appear monthly in the Music Cataloging Bulletin, which also compiles changes to Library of Congress subject headings and classification schedules, and includes book reviews and other information of interest to music catalogers. The clearest explanations and examples of these rule interpretations and cataloging decisions (as well as the best organized and indexed) are Richard Smiraglia's Cataloging Music: A Manual for Use with AACR2 (1986), and his Music Cataloging: The Bibliographic Control of Printed and Recorded Music in Libraries (1989). These two volumes provide

invaluable, easily understood assistance for working through the labyrinth of music cataloging rules.

If cataloging is the process of accurately describing the item in hand (originally the physical object, subsequently the intellectual content as well), classification is the mechanism for arranging or sequencing those items. It is not unheard of to "classify" materials by accession number, especially in this age of electronic indexing, where regardless of its physical location, an item can be found by any of dozens of access points. This most basic of methods binds the user to an index or catalog, however, which in the long run, may serve to make materials or information less accessible. Through classification, like materials can be located together, and searchers' efforts minimized.

Classification calls for arranging materials in a logical, systematic manner, to meet the needs of the users. Buth (1975) indicated that musical scores can be arranged according to any of these characteristics, most of which are based on the underlying AACR2 assumption of composer main-entry:

1) size (ranging from 19 cm. miniatures to 1 meter full scores),
2) format (collections, type of score),
3) alphabetic by composer or title,
4) medium (instrumentation, voice, ensemble size),
5) form (sonata, symphony, mass),
6) character (secular, sacred),
7) ethnicity,
8) style or historical period,
9) opus or thematic number.

The logical choice of which of these primary characteristics will provide the basis for classification depends on the primary users of the collection. According to Redfern (1978) performers generally prefer music to be arranged according to instrumentation or voicing. For example, they would like to find all piano sonatas together in one place, or all men's chorus music together, then arranged by composer or form.

There are several published classification schemes for music, all widely used in both their original and in modified forms. The number of modifications and the number of in-house schedules devised suggest the general dissatisfaction with existing schemes. Some classification systems have been developed solely for music; others, for the whole of human knowledge. Perhaps the one most widely shared attribute is the belief that music, and books about music should be separated, though it was not until the most recent, 20th edition, that the highly familiar and widely used Dewey Decimal Classification scheme (DDC20) accommodated such separation.

The Library of Congress Classification (LCC) and DDC20 are probably the two most widely used and best known classification schemes of all knowledge that include detailed schedules for music. LCC has remained largely unchanged since first published in 1904, except for the 1978 additions of modern terminology, some expanded subdivisions, and an

updated index. LCC separates music materials into three general categories--scores (class M), books about music (ML), and materials for teaching music and music theory (MT). Until DDC20, the Dewey system presented a problem for music libraries, because it did not provide a satisfactory method for separating music from materials about music. DDC20 completely changed the "780" schedules to address this separation, and now allows numbers to be constructed to class music scores by medium (DDC uses the term "executant"), form, character (e.g. sacred or secular), technique, or through other standard subdivisions. Of those schemes devised expressly for music, the most widely used and best known are the Dickinson Classification, the McColvin Scheme, and ANSCR--the Alpha-Numeric System for Classification of Sound Recordings (Smiraglia, 1989, Redfern, 1978). The McColvin Scheme was an adaptation of DDC developed by Lionel McColvin in 1937, whose primary contribution was the use of Dewey schedules, but with provision for separating music from music literature. The Dickinson Classification scheme, devised by George Dickinson in 1938 for Vassar College, was not an adaptation or revision of another scheme, though it does reflect many categories already present in LCC. The Dickinson Classification allows flexible use of the published schedules, with the intention that it be applied as needed to meet the specific needs of any given library. (Dickinson 19

recognized that a performance library would have needs different from those of a research or general library.) Dickinson used a numeric system combined with mnemonics and familiar music symbols, such as flats, naturals, and sharps (♭♮♯) in the classification scheme. Another useful scheme, developed in 1969 for public libraries is known as ANSCR (The Alpha-Numeric System for Classification of Sound Recordings). Unlike nearly all other systems for classifying music, ANSCR does not attempt to classify knowledge, but is utilitarian and was developed by study of users' search and retrieval patterns. ANSCR separates music into four broad categories: art music, commercial, spoken, and children's. These four categories are further subdivided into 36 subjects such as those found in commercial music houses. Within these categories, entries are distinguished by composer or performer, title proper, and the producer's serial number.

There are countless other schedules and schemes for organizing and classifying music materials, including the British Catalogue of Music Classification, The Bliss Classification, MLA Adaptation of DDC, numerous specialized schemes from Germany, and others. All are subject to regular interpretation, depending on the needs of the library. Any one may or may not be appropriate for a given setting. From the preceding discussion, it should be apparent that music librarianship is a highly codified discipline, requiring a

trained individual to digest and implement standards. As suggested earlier, it is rare for a cathedral music library to employ such an individual.

Related Research

The review of literature thus far has revealed that little is known about the collections of music housed in churches and cathedrals. In fact only these most basic assumptions can be made about such collections: 1) there is a long tradition of music performance and collecting of printed music in churches, 2) church librarians, where they exist, report little, if any responsibility for church music collections, and 3) although much is known about the distinct disciplines of church music and music librarianship, almost nothing specific is known about church or cathedral music libraries. Obviously, basic library procedures such as preservation and organization must be addressed, but additionally, the special problems of a performing ensemble are encountered. Because there is such an absence of even the most fundamental descriptive information about church music libraries, this study must begin with the related environments of church and performance libraries to benefit from their experience and to identify the unique, practical and research needs of libraries of church music. There are a few pioneering studies that attempt to quantify and describe

church libraries, and their findings may provide insight toward the needs of the cathedral music library. In compiling the first directory of church and synagogue libraries, Rodda and Harvey (1967) contacted 14,000 of an estimated 20,000 to 40,000 eligible libraries, and received 3,200 usable returns (23%). One of the difficulties cited was the problem of identifying and contacting church libraries which are governed by a wide assortment of denominational authorities, and are overwhelmingly run by volunteers. From this survey, a picture of the "typical" church or synagogue library emerged. It was run by three or four volunteers, had 100-500 books, circulated 10-40 books per week, and occupied 100-150 square feet of space. It had a budget of $100 annually. No collection of music scores was indicated, nor was any mention made of service to the church or synagogue music program.

White (1980) supervised a systematic survey of church and synagogue libraries from 1971-1975. Of her sample taken from 57,000 church and synagogue libraries, she found the Lutheran church accounted for the largest percentage of church libraries (31.2%), followed by the Presbyterian (16.2%), and Methodist (11.3%) churches. Thirty-nine percent of church and synagogue libraries reported collections in excess of 1,000 books; and again, no mention was made concerning collections of musical scores--though nearly 100%

reported collections of other non-book materials such as film-strips, recordings, and periodicals. Despite her attempt to identify and survey a representative sample, and to interpret the results in a useful manner, White's most confident, though somewhat facetious conclusion, was that the majority of church and synagogue libraries do not answer and return survey questionnaires. The most likely explanation for the low return of church library surveys is the absence of paid staff to complete and return such surveys. The memberships of the Lutheran Church Library Association, Southern Baptist Church Library Department, Cokesbury Church Library Department (Presbyterian, Methodist, and United Church of Christ libraries), Catholic Library Association, and Church and Synagogue Library Association total more than 46,000, yet the White study indicated only 12.5% of church libraries had any paid staff; the Rodda and Harvey survey concluded that "almost without exception" church and synagogue libraries were staffed by volunteers.

If church librarianship can provide little more than some skeletal demographic statistics, some further understanding may be gained from studies of performance music libraries and of choral scores. Probably most relevant to this study was the survey by Byrne (1987), of more than sixty performance organizations, ranging from conservatory ensembles to military and marching bands to orchestras of inter-

national stature. While the conclusions from this study are addressed to the non-professional volunteer managers of performance music collections, the stature of the contributing organizations would indicate that the data were provided by professionals. Byrne found that 20% of the responding libraries used Library of Congress Classification; 70% used in-house classification systems; 16% maintained no authority files; and 30% maintained automated catalogs on personal computers. The real value of this study is the contribution by professionals, of practical approaches to managing traditional library tasks, as well as addressing many of the special problems inherent in performance libraries. This is the first such study to address the unique needs of performance libraries in such depth.

The International Association of Music Libraries (United Kingdom) has sponsored two studies concerning libraries of choral scores. Though they have only slight bearing on this investigation, they support the opinion that libraries housing multiple copies of performance scores are unique and in need of further documentation. In 1977 Clegg surveyed the five music conservatory libraries in Britain to obtain a basic description of holdings and practices. She found collections of multiple copies of choral works that ranged from 20,000 to 100,000 items. These five different libraries used combinations of seven different classification schemes. Clark

and Linehan (1987) conducted a similar study of a random sample of the academic, public, and national libraries of Britain. Among their conclusions were the need for a national coordination to avoid duplication and provide greater depth, and a need for standardized nomenclature. Both of these studies indicate the same problems apparent in cathedral music libraries: isolation and its attendant lack of standardization.

Choral directors and musicians provide little guidance or documentation of music librarianship despite their pre-eminent role in organizing and managing music materials. In The Volunteer Choir, Brownstead and McCollam (1987) offer one paragraph concerning the organization and maintenance of the choral music collection. Their recommendation is to use accession numbering and volunteer library assistance. Nordin (1973) recommended alphabetical filing by title, and indicated that maintaining a catalog or index is optional. In a relatively lengthy article about musicians' use of computers, Sherbon (1983) alluded briefly to the role of the personal computer to maintain the music library, but provided no details.

Nearly 20 years ago, in Choral Conducting: A Symposium, Walter Collins Wrote:

> The whole problem of lists of choral publications is a classic one of information retrieval which cries out for computerization. Consider how helpful it would be, for instance, if a conductor could easily and quickly acquire a list of all editions in print of choral pieces which were written in the Romantic era, which were of no more than medium difficulty, whose tenor part did not go any higher than F, and whose text was appropriate for Easter.... Compiling such lists is exactly what computers are able to do most efficiently (1973, p. 126).

Despite Collins' recognition of the need to catalog choral music collections on computer, as long ago as 1973, apparently little progress has been made in this direction--at least very little that has been documented. In the December, 1978 issue of Music Educators Journal, Lawrence and Allison described Choralist, a database developed by the Kent State University School of Music, University Libraries, and University Computer Services. Choralist is a mainframe-based system relying on encoded information. The authors acknowledge that Choralist is not a library catalog, rather it is a selection tool for choral directors, drawn from single examination copies of scores, which are filed by accession number in the music library. As it was originally developed, each record contained only 13 fields with a maximum record size of 79 characters.

A brief series of articles, "The Computer and the Church Musician," by David Herman, appeared sporadically in The American Organist from 1983 to 1986. The fourth in this series, "A Choral Library," described how Herman used an

Apple IIgs computer and Appleworks software to create a church music library catalog. Again, each individual record was considerably restricted--here only 156 characters, and while fields included were logical (composer, title, voicing, publisher, etc.), lack of adherence to international standards make this database useful for only one collection; any other library will have to duplicate the effort, rather than share it.

Objectives

The available literature related to this study has come from many camps. The discrete disciplines of music history and church history are well established and provide useful documentation of the growth of church music and church music libraries. Likewise, the fields of music librarianship, church librarianship, and music performance shed some light on the nature and condition of performance libraries of choral music scores. None of these fields, however, offers a comprehensive view of the state of church music libraries. It is this void that this study seeks to fill.

In fact, data collection in this arena of churches, synagogues, or cathedrals presents unique challenges, due to the absence of permanent staff responsible for these collections which most assuredly exist. The present study seeks to describe the practices used by Roman Catholic

cathedrals for cataloging, organizing, and otherwise managing the day-to-day operations of their libraries of choral music scores. While the Roman Catholic church neither mandates establishment of music libraries, nor suggests guidelines for their operation, The Constitution on Sacred Liturgy (1985) does, however, state "The treasure of sacred music is to be preserved and fostered with great care. Choirs must be diligently developed, especially in cathedral churches..." (p.30). As the principal church in the diocese, a majority of Roman Catholic cathedrals have met this commission, and have formal music programs with a paid professional music director and an organized choir. This population then, suggested one solution for data collection, in that both a collection of music and a professional staff member to manage that collection, were assumed to be present. Though the data from this population cannot necessarily be generalized to other populations, it does clearly document, for the first time, one segment of the church music library scene. Despite a certain homogeneity, Roman Catholic cathedrals represent a broad geographic dispersion and evidence a wide range of musical programming, staff size, budget, congregation size, and organizational practices.

Because so little is known about cathedral music collections, this study is necessarily exploratory, to describe basic demographic characteristics, to identify current music

practices, and to assess cathedral musicians' interest in improving music library organization and retrieval. Specifically, the goals of this study are:

1. to determine the overall structure in place in Roman Catholic cathedral music libraries (basic demographics, staffing, collection size, etc.),

2. to reveal the extent to which cathedral music collections are currently cataloged, classified, and/or indexed; and if demographics impact on such library practices,

3. to learn whether printed or automated catalogs, indexes, or authority files are consulted or maintained in these collections, and

4. to measure the level of interest of cathedral musicians in networking to improve or enhance library tasks in the cathedral music library.

Definitions

anthem - in sacred vocal music, a choral setting of scriptural text, in English, intended to be sung by a choir.

cathedral - the principal church in a diocese, the one in which the bishop has his seat.

cathedral music library - the collection of music scores owned by a cathedral, for the purpose of rehearsals and liturgical and concert performance by a choir. For the purposes of this study, cathedral music library, church music library, and music collection are often used interchangeably, and refer only to vocalist's scores, not to instrumental scores, or to reference books or recordings.

choral scores - musical scores written for performance by a chorus or choir of voices. Choral score is used here as a more inclusive term for any music written for chorus; AACR2 terms score, chorus score, vocal score, and close score are more specific and therefore more limiting and inappropriate for this study.

diocese - the primary ecclesiastical district of the Roman Catholic church, under the jurisdiction of a bishop. Each diocese consists of many parishes, or congregations, and along with other dioceses constitutes a province.

hymn - any song of praise, thanks, or devotion, intended for congregational singing.

mass/mass setting - in music, used interchangeably, referring to the musical parts of the Eucharistic celebration. A mass setting traditionally contains the Kyrie eleison, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Benedictus, and Angus Dei.

motet - a vocal composition written in a polyphonic, or harmonic style, using varied rhythms, usually based on sacred texts, originally always in Latin, intended for use in a church.

music director-the principal musician of the cathedral. In some dioceses the music director may be the head of a staff of several organists, choirs, and assistants; more often, the music director is responsible for all liturgical celebrations, conducting choirs, providing organ accompaniment, and serving as diocesan consultant for music.

octavo - the standard, roughly 6" x 9" form of choral music scores. Octavos average from 2 to 15 pages, and usually contain the parts for soprano, alto, tenor, bass, and piano (or organ) accompaniment on separate, vertically aligned staves.

part-song - any song written for more than one part, or voice.

psalm - any of the psalms, hymns, or prayers taken from the Old Testament Book of Psalms.

publisher number - the publisher's self-assigned serial number, used to organized and identify specific scores in a publisher's stock. In music cataloging, publisher numbers are usually used much the same as "standard numbers" assigned to books.

score - the printed notation of all the parts of a musical work in vertical alignment.

service music - music written for use in liturgical celebration other that a full mass setting: sung responses, independent mass parts, etc.

voice/voicing - the range of parts for which a choral composition is written, for example: soprano, alto tenor, bass (abbreviated SATB); soprano, alto, baritone (abbreviated SAB); soprano 1, soprano 2, alto (abbreviated (SSA); and so on.

Methodology

Design

A mail survey was selected as an efficient and effective means for data collection in this exploratory study of these otherwise undocumented libraries. A survey instrument was developed that contained both closed and open-ended questions pertaining to:

1. demographics (size of diocese and congregation served; size of choir; number of personnel),
2. usage characteristics (number of rehearsals and services per week),
3. collection size and maintenance procedures, and
4. reference sources, and current and desired indexing practices.

The survey was designed so that respondents could begin by answering simpler, descriptive and demographic questions. The intent was to have respondents become involved in the survey before posing more complicated or "revealing" questions.

Ideally, the instrument should have been pilot tested with a small sample of the population; however, all members of the target population were included in the study. To supplant a full pilot study, the instrument was reviewed for clarity and completeness, and pretested by three professional librarians and five church musicians. These individuals were selected because of their knowledge of library, music, or music library practices. Suggestions from these individuals were incorporated into the survey.

The survey instrument and a description of the study were submitted to the Kent State University Human Subjects Review Board in mid-April, 1992. Approval to proceed with the study was granted on April 20, 1992.

Sample Selection

The population studied, Roman Catholic cathedral musicians, was selected to overcome one of the obstacles observed in earlier related studies, namely, low rate of survey return, due to difficulty in accurately identifying individuals within the church population to receive the instrument. By restricting the sample to the Roman Catholic cathedral population that is finite and manageable in size, and where it is reasonably safe to assume there is a professional staff member present, it was believed that response rate could be improved. One hundred eighty-five cathedrals were identified through the 1992 Official Catholic Directory, thus assuring that all cathedrals were included in the study. Names of specific cathedral music directors were found through the current directory of the Conference of Roman Catholic Cathedral Musicians (CRCCM). One hundred nineteen (64%) of the 185 cathedrals were represented in CRCCM. Surveys were directed to these 119 by name; the remaining 66 surveys were addressed to "Music Director" at the cathedral address.

Procedure

On May 11, 1992, the survey was mailed to the sample of 185 U.S. cathedrals. A cover letter outlined the purpose of the study and assured confidentiality. Also enclosed was a postage-paid, pre-addressed envelope and a letter of support for the study from St. Joseph Cathedral (Columbus, Ohio) Director of Music, James Hecht, encouraging participation. It was hoped that this endorsement might further increase response rate. Survey participants were requested to complete and return the survey by June 5, 1992. While respondents were not required to identify themselves in any way, return envelopes were coded to monitor response. Upon receipt, the coded envelope and returned survey were separated to assure anonymity.

In order to maximize returns, a reminder note with a second copy of the survey was mailed to non-respondents in June, and in July a third reminder was sent. With the third mailing was another copy of the survey, and a pre-paid post-card, that allowed the recipient to acknowledge receipt of the survey, and indicate the absence of a music program, or preference for non-participation in the study.

Data Analysis

Analysis of the data called for collation, description, and interpretation. Descriptive statistics have been used to present some of the relationships revealed, and the chi-

square test has been employed where appropriate to test for significant relationships between variables. For the few open-ended questions, responses were read and appropriate categories were developed, requiring the loss of only the most subtle of detail.

Findings

Between May 15, 1992, and July 20, 1992, 125 of the 185 cathedral musicians returned responses to the survey, representing a return rate of sixty-seven percent. Of those 125, twelve returned only the postcard indicating that they chose not to participate in the study, or that there was currently no regularly organized music program at their cathedral. The remaining 113 responses represent a usable return rate of sixty-one percent. It is clear from earlier studies of church libraries that mass mailings to a large sample of the church library population does not necessarily generate a large return rate. Recall that Rodda and Harvey (1967) indicated only a 23% return rate, and White (1980) yielded only 18% usable returns. Babbie indicates that a 50% response rate is adequate, and that 60% can be "considered good" (1990, p. 182). For this exploratory study then, especially when compared with previous church library surveys, the response rate can be considered good. Surveys addressed to music directors by name were returned at a somewhat higher rate (72%) than were those addressed merely

to "Music Director" (64%). The following discussion is based upon the returned surveys. Though some respondents did not answer every question, all usable data have been tabulated.

Because there are no available studies of cathedral music libraries similar to the present one, many of the survey questions were designed to aid in establishing baseline data concerning the context in which these libraries function--their size, and the size of choirs, rehearsal and performance schedules, congregations, and dioceses they support.

Diocesan and Parish Size

Music directors were asked to report the population count of both their parish congregation and the larger diocese served by their cathedral. One hundred percent (113) of the returned surveys contained diocesan populations, while 89% (101) reported parish size. Data provided were divided into quartiles and both parish and diocesan size have been labelled as small, medium, large, or very large.

Table 1 shows lowest and highest population for parishes, the ranges, medians, and means for each quartile, as well as for the total sample. The standard deviation for the total sample and the coefficient of skewness are also reported.

The data indicate a significant variation in the size of cathedral parishes, from a low of 26 to a high of 17,000. The standard deviation is large, nearly 2,500. The coefficient

of skewness is 1.11, indicating that the data are positively skewed, that is, small to medium sized parishes outnumber larger ones; in fact, as can be seen, the mean parish size

Table 1: Parish Size by Quartile

	low	high	range	median	mean
Q1 (n=25) Small	26	600	574	400	371
Q2 (n=25) Medium	600	950	350	800	763
Q3 (n=25) Large	1,029	2,400	1,371	1,600	1,637
Q4 (n=26) Very Large	2,500	17,000	14,500	3,800	4,922
Total (n=101)	26	17,000	16,974	1,029	1,953

Standard deviation for the total sample = 2,491
Coefficient of skewness = 1.11

for the total sample is 1,953, and only six cathedrals have parishes exceeding 5,000 members. An examination of the first three quartiles shows that they are similar--in each case nearly coinciding. Except for the fourth quartile, the distribution would be symmetrical. It is interesting that the medians almost systematically double from one quartile to the next.

Table 2 shows similar data to Table 1, except that the data tabulated are for the larger district served by a cathedral, the diocese. As with parish size it can be seen that the standard deviation is large (423,998), and the data are positively skewed (.99). Again, the medians and means of the first three quartiles are similar, suggesting symmetry.

Table 2: Diocesan Size by Quartile

	low	high	range	median	mean
Q1 (n=28) Small	28.000	80.000	52.000	62.170	57.364
Q2 (n=28) Medium	81.346	160.000	78.654	124.538	122.749
Q3 (n=28) Large	175.625	330.000	154.375	232.500	233.162
Q4 (n=29) Very large	331.000	2.500.000	2.169.000	605.221	819.718
Total (n=113)	28.000	2.500.000	2.472.000	175.625	314.997

Standard deviation for the total sample = 423,998
Coefficient of skewness = .99

While this population distribution indicates a normal sample, perhaps more interesting and significant than population distributions, is the size of cathedral choirs, their accompanying music libraries, and the relationships among choirs, libraries, and sponsoring populations. Music directors were asked to categorize their choir as either small (less than ten members), medium (11-25 members), large (26-40 members), or very large (more than 40 members). Four choirs (3.5%) were characterized as small, 37 (32.7%) as medium, 55 (48.7%) as large, and 17 (15%) as very large.

Collections

A collection of choral music scores can be counted and interpreted in two ways. Multiple copies of individual titles (one for each singer) is the norm for a choral music library. Thus, a choir of 25 members with 1,000 scores may in fact be housing only 40 titles (25 members x 40 titles = 1,000 scores). On the other hand a choir of 10 members with 1,000

scores is managing (acquiring, cataloging, etc.) 100 titles (10 members x 100 titles = 1,000 scores). Cathedral music directors were asked to provide both figures regarding the size of their music collections, the number of titles and the total number of scores. Table 3 shows the total number of scores by quartile, where the labels very small, small,

Table 3: Number of Scores in Cathedral Music Libraries by Quartile

Library Size	low	high	range	median	mean
Very small Libraries (n=25)	160	3,000	2,840	1,600	1,363
Small Libraries (n=25)	3,000	7,500	4,500	5,000	4,979
Medium Libraries (n=25)	7,500	15,000	7,500	10,000	10,176
Large Libraries (n=25)	15,000	90,000	75,000	25,000	29,090
Total (n=100)	160	90,000	89,840	7,500	11,511

Standard deviation for the total sample = 14,149
Coefficient of Skewness = .28

medium, and large have been assigned. The seemingly obvious relationships that might be hypothesized are those between choir size and number of titles, or between choir size and total collection size, where the null hypothesis is

$$H_0: P_S = P_M = P_L = P_V$$

and alternately H_1: P_S, P_M, P_L, P_V are not equal

where P_S = Proportion of small choirs with any given size music library,
P_M = Proportion of medium choirs with any given size music library,
P_L = Proportion of large choirs with any give size music library,
P_V = Proportion of very large choirs with any given size music library

Table 4 provides the contingency table to test this hypothesis for total collection size, where observed and expected occurrences of collection size are recorded. Because of the relatively small sample, choir size categories have been collapsed to small/medium and large/very large. The chi-square value calculated for this table (24.421) falls outside the acceptance area (7.815) of the distribution table, thus the null hypothesis is rejected, and there is indeed a relationship between choir size and collection size.

Table 4: Contingency Table - Collection Size by Choir Size

	Choir Size				
	small/medium		large/very large		total
Collection Size	#	%	#	%	#
Very small collections					
(observed)	16	47	9	14	25
(expected)	8.5		16.5		
Small collections					
(observed)	11	32	14	21	25
(expected)	8.5		16.5		
Medium collections					
(observed)	7	21	18	27	25
(expected)	8.5		16.5		
Large collections					
(observed)	0	0	25	38	25
(expected)	8.5		16.5		
Total	34	100	36	100	100

Chi-square value: 24.421 Degrees of freedom = 3
Critical chi-square value = 7.815 Confidence level = .05

Similarly it might be hypothesized that a relationship exists between the number of titles and the size of the choir. Tables 5 and 6 present the number of titles in cathedral music libraries by quartile and the accompanying contingency table to test this relationship. The hypothesis

is the same as that used to test the relationship between total collection size and choir size above. Again, data have been collapsed in the contingency table.

Table 5: Number of Titles in Cathedral Music Libraries by Quartile

	low	high	range	median	mean
Very small libraries (n=26)	20	150	130	98	87
Small libraries (n = 27)	150	250	100	200	198
Medium libraries (N=27)	250	400	150	334	326
Large libraries (n=26)	450	1,500	1,050	600	693
Total (n=106)	20	1,500	1,480	250	325

Standard deviation for the total sample = 262.15
Coefficient of skewness = .86

Table 6: Contingency Table - Number of Titles by Choir Size

	Choir Size				
Number of Titles	small/medium		large/very large		total
	#	%	#	%	#
Very small collections (observed)	15	42	11	16	26
(expected)	8.9		17.1		
Small collections (observed)	9	25	18	26	27
(expected)	9.2		17.7		
Medium collections (observed)	7	19	19	27	26
(expected)	8.9		17.1		
Large collections (observed)	5	14	21	30	26
(expected)	8.9		17.1		
Total	36	99	69	99	105

Chi-square value = 9.574 Degrees of freedom = 3
Critical chi-square value = 7.815 Confidence level = .05

Again it can be seen that the chi-square value calculated for this table falls outside of the acceptance

area, so the null hypothesis is rejected, that is, there is a relationship between the size of the choir and the number of titles supporting that choir. The relationship between other population variables and the size of the music collection were also tested. As Tables 7 and 8 demonstrate, there is a relationship between the diocesan population and both the number of tiesl and the total collection size. Parish size was not related to either of the collection size variables.

Table 7: Contingency Table - Number of Titles by Diocesan Size

	Diocesan Population (x 1000)								
	28-81		82-176		80-331		336-2,500		total
No.Titles	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Small Libraries									
(observed)	20	80	13	52	12	48	7	28	52
(expected)	13		13		13		13		.
Medium/Large									
(observed)	5	20	12	48	13	52	18	72	48
(expected)	12		12		12	.	12		.
Total	25	100	25	100	25	100	25	100	100

Chi-sqaure value = 11.74 Degrees of freedom = 3
Critical chi-square value = 7.81 Confidence level = .05

Table 8: Contingency Table - Total Collection by Diocesan Size

	Diocesan Population (x 1000)								
	28-81		82-176		80-331		336-2,500		total
Collection Size	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Small Libraries									
(observed)	19	76	14	56	10	40	9	36	52
(exptected)	13		13		13		13		.
Medium/Large									
(observed)	6	24	11	44	15	60	16	64	48
(expected)	12		12		12		12		.
Total	25	100	25	100	25	100	25	100	100

Chi-square value = 9.91 Degrees of freedom = 3
Critical chi-square value = 7.81 Confidence level = .05

Funding

Respondents were asked to provide several indicators of funding support: the average expenditure for new acquisitions annually, the average number of new music titles purchased annually, the number of paid singers, and other paid staff. Seventy-seven music directors reported average annual music budgets, while another 18 provided comments such as "open," or "no budget--whatever we need is usually provided." Table 9 provides ranges and measures of central tendency for music budgets, by choir size

Table 9: Annual Music Budget by Choir Size

	low	high	range	median	mean
Small Choirs (n=1)	800	800	0	800	800
Medium Choirs (n=21)	100	3,000	2,900	1,179	1,125
Large Choirs (n=40)	200	5,500	5,300	1,500	1,763
Very Large Choirs (n=15)	400	7,000	6,600	2,550	2,713
Total (n=77)	$100	$7,000	$6,900	$1,500	$1,777

One hundred eight respondents reported an estimated or "typical" number of new titles purchased annually, which provides a less specific indicator of funding. Small choirs reported mean annual purchases of 20 new titles; medium choirs, a mean of 11; large choirs, 17 titles; and very large choirs, 16. For the total population, the mean number of titles purchased yearly was 15.

Other indicators of financial support for the music program are the number of paid singers and paid staff. Three

choirs (3%) reported paying all singers; eleven (10%) pay four "section leaders;" Twenty-six (23%) rely entirely on volunteers. Sixty-seven cathedrals (59%) have at least one fulltime music director, and 46 (41%) report having only parttime musicians. Table 10 provides a matrix showing mean budgets, annual new title acquisitions (acq.), and number of full and parttime music staffs, by size of choir.

Table 10: Matrix of Financial Support Indicators

	Budget	Acq.	FTstaff	PTstaff
Small Choirs (n=4)	800	20	.5	.5
Medium Choirs (n=37)	1,125	11	.4	1.5
Large Choirs (n=55)	1,763	17	.8	1.6
Very Large Choirs (n=17)	2,713	16	1.1	1.8
Total Population	$1,777	15	.7	1.5

Music Library Management

Not surprisingly, no cathedral music director reported that the music library is managed by a paid professional librarian. Overall, 58 music directors (51%) report they are the principal "music librarian." Four (4%) cathedral music libraries are run by assistant directors; four (4%) by paid clerks or secretaries; 35 (31%) by volunteers with no library training; and 12 (11%) by volunteers with library training (all percents rounded to nearest whole number). In Table 11 it can be seen that there is an inverse relationship between staffing level and choir size. Music librarianship is

shifted from director to volunteer as the size of the choir increases.

Table 11: Music Librarian by Size of Choir

	Director		Assistant		Clerk		Volunteer	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Small Choirs (n=4)	3	75	0	0	0	0	1	25
Medium Choirs (n=37)	26	70	3	8	2	5	6	17
Large Choirs (n=55)	25	45	0	0	1	2	29	53
Very Large Choirs (n=17)	4	24	1	6	1	6	11	65
Total Polpulation	58	51	4	4	4	4	47	42

Location

Unlike a library of books, because they are almost "pamphlet-like," thousands of choral scores can be stored in a relatively small space. Seventeen respondents (15%) reported that music libraries are housed in rooms specifically designated for that purpose. Twenty-seven (24%) house the library in the rehearsal room; 29 (24%) in the director's office; 3 (2%) in another building; 45 (40%) in other locations. (Percents total greater than 100 because some respondents reported more than one location.) Because choral music libraries are concerned with storing and retrieving multiple copies of individual titles, mechanisms must be devised to keep sets of music together. Fifty-seven (50%) cathedrals use boxes which are stored on shelves or in cabinets for this purpose; 79 (70%) file in folders in filing cabinets; 12 (10%) use large envelopes; and 8 (7%) use

expanding files or wallets. (Again, many respondents indicate using more than one system, thus percents total more than one hundred.)

Catalog

Respondents were asked to indicate how their music library catalog was maintained. Thirty-one cathedrals (27%) use a system of cards, much as any traditional library. Thirty (27%) use personal computers to maintain an electronic catalog; and 13 (12%) reported using "other" systems. For instance, several cathedrals keep a single copy of every octavo score, filed alphabetically by composer or title, as an "index" copy. One music director reported that he kept his inventory "in my head." The most commonly reported catalog was a listing in a notebook, usually alphabetical by title. Sixty-three respondents (56%) reported using this system. many music directors indicated using more than one system. Five use both cards and a notebook; 7 use cards and computer; 6 use notebook and computer; and 4 are using cards, notebook, and computer. It might be assumed that many of these are using computers to produce notebook lists and cards before moving entirely to an electronic catalog, much as most traditional libraries do.

It is possible to view the cataloging system according to choir size, but perhaps more revealing is to compare the type of catalog maintained to the collection size, to the

individuals charged with catalog maintenance, and to budget. As can be seen in Table 12, volunteers are responsible for managing libraries that use catalog systems that are relatively more labor-intensive, such as card catalogs and electronic databases. For less complicated systems such as notebook lists and "other" catalogs, music directors retain the role of music librarian.

Table 12: Catalog System by Music Librarian

	Type of Catalog							
	cards (n=31)		notebook (n=63)		computer (n=30)		other (n=13)	
Librarian	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Director	8	26	38	60	6	20	9	70
Assistant	0	0	2	3	1	3	2	15
Clerk	3	10	1	2	3	10	0	0
Volunteer	20	64	22	35	20	67	2	15

Table 13 shows how the choice of the type of library catalog differs when compared to the mean annual acquisition rate and the collection size. Here it can be seen that notebooks are used to catalog the smallest collections; "other" systems and card catalogs for the next largest collections, and finally computers are used for the largest collections. When comparing type of catalog to annual number of acquisitions, it can be seen that collections adding more titles annually catalog those acquisitions electronically.

Table 13: Matrix Showing Catalog, Acquisitions, and Size of Cathedral Music Collections

	mean no.purchases	mean no.titles	mean no.scores
Card catalog	15.3	345	13,829
Notebook	15.4	284	8,662
Computer	19.7	461	18,194
Other	15.1	294	9,038

Budget does not apparently impact on the choice of catalog system, as indicated by Tables 14 and 15. Table 14 shows the type of catalog according to annual budget; Table 15 provides the contingency table to test for this relationship. Some data have been collapsed in Table 13. The null hypothesis here states that there will be no significant difference in choice of catalog dependent on budget. The chi-square value (2.97) is well below the critical value (11.07), so this hypothesis is accepted.

Table 14: Library Catalog by Budget

	Budget			
Catalog	Q1 (n=19) $100-750	Q2 (n=19) $800-1500	Q3 (n=20) $1500-2000	Q4 (n=19) $2500-7000
Cards	6	3	6	9
Notebook	13	11	11	8
Computer	4	5	10	7
Other	2	1	2	1

Table 15: Contingency Table - Library Catalog by Budget

	Budget				
	Q1 + Q2 $100-$1500		Q3 + Q4 $1500-$7000		Total
Catalog	#	%	#	%	#
Cards					
(observed)	9	20	12	22	24
(expected)	11		13		
Notebook					
(observed)	24	53	19	35	43
(expected)	20		23		
Computer & Other					
(observed)	12	26	20	37	32
(expected)	14		17		
Total	45	99	54	99	99

Chi-square value = 2.97 Degrees of freedom = 5
Critical chi-square value = 11.07 Confidence level = .05

Standards and Authority Control

A majority of music directors report a lack of library standards and authority control in their catalogs. Of the 113 respondents, none reported cataloging in MARC format; only one (less than 1%) indicated adherence to Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2nd edition (AACR2). Twenty respondents (28%) reported maintenance of authority lists of composers and/or titles. Table 16 presents the number and percent of total respondents indicating maintenance of authority lists. It is apparent that computer database users have discovered to a greater extent, the value and necessity of authorities and controlled vocabulary; similarly, volunteer professional librarians adhere to authorized headings more frequently than do other segments of the population.

Table 16: Cathedral Music Libraries Reporting Use of Authorized Headings - by Catalog and Librarian

Type of Catalog	Number	Percent
Card Catalog (n=31)	6	19
Notebook (n=63)	12	19
Computer (n=30)	12	40
Other (n=13)	1	8

Librarian	Number	Percent
Director (n=58)	7	12
Assistant (n=4)	1	25
Clerk (n=4)	2	50
Volunteer (n=35)	5	14
Volunteer Lib. (n=12)	5	42

Classification and Indexing

Unlike Byrne's 1987 survey of bands and orchestras, where he found that 20% of respondents used Library of Congress Classification, and 70% had in-house systems, none of the cathedral music libraries surveyed uses a standard, published classification system. Thirteen music directors (12%) report having documented, in-house systems. Ten (9%) indicated they group (classify) music by voicing. For example, they locate music for men's or women's voices separately from music for mixed choruses. Forty-four libraries (39%) class music according to broad categories such as Easter, Christmas, general, etc. Sixty-one respondents (54%) indicated that no such system of categorizing or classification is used. (Percents total more than 100 because some respondents indicated more than one system.) Of the 88 responding, 60 music directors (68%) reported they file music alphabetically by title. This might be the only filing system, or might be used in conjunction with one of the

broader systems described above. For example, it is possible that in some libraries music is classed by voicing, then arranged alphabetically. Eight (9%) file by composer; 18 (20%) use accession number filing; and one (1%) indicated use of another system. It is interesting that only nine percent use composer as "main entry." Clearly, unlike the larger library environment, in cathedral music libraries, filing by titles is the preferred method, despite the fact that much choral music is known by numerous titles and in various languages. As can be seen in Table 17, A comparison of the classification (filing) system to the type of catalog maintained reveals no apparent relationships. Regardless of the type of catalog, title is the preferred main entry.

Table 17: Filing System by Catalog Type

	Catalog Type								
	Cards		Notebook		Computer		Other		Total
Filing System	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Title	13	52	34	72	13	59	9	81	69
Composer	1	4	5	10	1	4	2	18	9
Accession No.	10	40	8	17	8	36	0	0	26
Other	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	25	99	47	99	22	99	11	99	105

Respondents were asked to indicate which of six published research tools, reference sources and/or indexes to choral music they used. These six were the Lectionary, the Roman Gradual, Sacred Music in Print, The Psalm Locator, the Catalogue of Choral Music Arranged in Biblical Order, and

"other." See appendix A for a description of these works. One hundred two (90%) indicated they used the Lectionary; fifty-two (46%) use the Roman Gradual; twenty-eight (25%) use Sacred Music in Print; sixteen (14%) use The Psalm Locator; fifteen (13%) indicated using the Catalogue of Choral Music Arranged in Biblical Order; and sixteen (14%) listed "other" sources. Most commonly cited "other" works were publishers' catalogs, hymnal indexes, other liturgical works, and personal bibliographies.

Directors were further asked to identify any "finding aids" or indexes they had developed themselves. Fifty-six respondents (50%) have prepared title indexes to their collections; forty-two (37%) have developed seasonal/liturgical use indexes; and 39 (35%) have composer indexes. It might be assumed that larger collections would have greater need of "cross-references" or indexes, but the data indicate that the size of music collection bears little relationship to the presence of indexes, that is, title, composer, and other indexes appear to be proportionately present in very small, small, medium, and large music libraries. In fact, with only one exception, the type of catalog, indexes were reported present in roughly equivalent numbers regardless of any other variable under consideration: collection size, choir size, director tenure, etc. Collections cataloged on personal computers report an almost consistently higher incidence of most indexes. Similarly, those collections cataloged on

cards generally index more than those using notebooks or "other" systems. Table 18 presents the number and percent of occurrences of various indexes by the type of catalog.

Table 18: Indexes Reported by Type of Library Catalog

	Catalog Type							
	card cat. (n=31)		notebook (n=63)		computer (n=30)		other (n=13)	
Index	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Title index	26	84	25	40	23	76	4	31
Composer index	18	58	15	24	22	73	1	8
Ed./Arranger index	2	6	1	2	7	23	0	0
First line index	1	1	3	5	3	10	1	8
Publisher index	6	19	5	4	12	40	0	0
Publisher no. index	4	13	2	2	8	27	0	0
Scripture ref. index	9	29	8	13	10	33	1	8
Season/use index	15	48	17	27	10	33	5	38
Voicing index	8	26	8	13	14	47	1	8
Performance index	5	16	11	16	5	17	1	8
Other indexes	0	0	1	2	4	13	1	8

A related question was asked of cathedral music directors to assign a value to the various above-mentioned indexes, using the scale of 1 to 5 (1 being "not that useful," to 5 indicating "very useful"). Table 19 shows the mean values assigned to the various index headings, in rank order from most useful to least useful. "Other" indexes cited by directors as very useful were language, instrumentation, key word, and category--motet, anthem, carol, etc.

Table 19: Rank Order of Cathedral Music Library Indexes

Very Useful	5.0
Title Index	4.8
Season/use Index	4.6
Scripture Reference Index	4.2
Composer Index	3.9
First line Index	3.2
Voicing Index	3.2
Moderately Useful	3.0
Performance record Index	2.9
Editor/arranger Index	2.3
Publisher Index	2.0
Not that Useful	1.0

These values too, were fairly consistent regardless of other variables. When compared to choir size, collection size, (both number of titles and total number of scores), by type of catalog, and in concert with other published indexes, the values change little, if at all. One variable suggests a slight relationship to the expressed values of indexes, namely, tenure of the director. Table 20 shows the value assigned to each of the index headings by directors with less than 5 years at the present position, those with 5 to 10 years, 11 to 20 years, and more than 20 years. When viewing the mean values, by length of tenure, it can be seen that directors with fewer years at their current position tend to value most of the indexes slightly more than do their counterparts with more years familiarity with their collections.

Finally, cathedral music directors were surveyed for their attitudes toward enhancement of library practices in

Table 20: Value of Indexes by Director Tenure

Index	Tenure <5 yrs	5-10 yrs	10-20 yrs	>20 yrs	mean
Title	4.9	4.6	4.9	5.0	4.8
Season/Use	4.7	4.5	4.2	4.9	4.6
Scripture	4.5	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.2
Composer	4.6	3.6	4.0	3.4	3.9
First line	3.4	3.0	2.8	3.3	3.2
Voicing	3.4	3.2	3.2	2.2	3.2
Perf. Record	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.9
Ed./Arranger	2.5	2.2	2.4	1.7	2.3
Publisher	2.1	1.9	1.6	1.3	2.0
Publisher No.	1.9	1.7	1.6	1.2	1.8
Mean	3.5	3.2	3.1	3.0	3.3

their music libraries, and to indicate their interest in information-sharing networks such as those in place in the larger library environment. Respondents were asked, regardless of current practices in their music collections, if some form of catalog, index, or database would be useful in the cathedral music library. Overall, eighty-eight (78%) of the music directors responded affirmatively, seventeen (15%) said no, and eight (7%) did not respond. Table 21 compares the attitude toward a library catalog to the current form of catalog in use.

As can be seen, while current users of all forms of catalog feel such tools are useful, it is those cathedrals

Table 21: Attitude Toward a Cathedral Music Library Catalog by Current Type of Catalog in Use

	Current Form of Catalog							
	card cat. (n=31)		notebook (n=63)		computer (n=30)		other (n=13)	
Attitude	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Consider a Catalog Useful (n=88)	27	87	46	73	27	90	10	77
Do Not Consider Catalog Useful (n=17)	0	0	13	21	0	0	3	23
No response (n=8)	4	13	4	6	3	10	0	0

using more traditional library catalogs (card catalogs or computers) who are more favorably disposed than are those using notebooks and other systems. Further, cathedrals with larger numbers of titles view a catalog as more useful than do cathedrals with smaller collections; eighty-five percent of cathedrals with larger collections responded positively, compared to 75% of those with smaller libraries.

Music directors were asked if they wanted assistance in developing such catalogs or indexes. Fifty-seven (50%) responded yes, forty-six (41%) said no, and ten (9%) offered no response. Many respondents referred to budgetary restraints --they indicated that they may personally "want" assistance, but there were no resources for such. More interesting than budget were attitudes toward assistance compared with who currently fills the role of music librarian. Table 22 illustrates the relationship between attitude and music librarian.

Table 22: Attitude Toward Catalog Assistance by Music Librarian

	want assistance (n=57)		no assistance (n=46)	
Librarian	#	%	#	%
Music Director	21	37	32	70
Assistant	2	4	2	4
Clerk	1	2	3	7
Volunteer	24	42	7	15
Volunteer Librarian	9	15	2	4

It is interesting that although forty-six (45%) of the 103 music directors responding to this question indicated they do not want assistance, 32 of that 46 (70%) serve as the music librarian personally. Of the 57 (55%) who indicated a desire for help, 36 (63%) have already delegated library responsibility to others. This may indicate an overall inclination to either delegate or maintain full authority over the collection, that is, those who have already "sought assistance" by turning over library maintenance to another individual are more positively inclined to seek further assistance than are those who choose to manage their music libraries themselves. Another relationship may be present. The number of respondents indicating a desire for assistance with developing a library catalog increases dramatically as the size of the music library does (the number of titles). Thirty-five percent of those with very small libraries want assistance, as do 59% of those with small and medium-sized

collections, and 92% of music directors with large collections.

Regarding what might be analogous to the development of a union catalog, or some form of shared information network, there is considerable interest among cathedral music directors. Ninety (80%) of the 113 respondents indicated interest in knowing about the holdings of other cathedral collections. This interest increases as does the size of the collection. Sixty-two percent of respondents in the first quartile, 85% of those in the second, 89% of those in the third, and 92% of those in the fourth quartile expressed interest. Perhaps even more interesting is that a larger number are willing to share information than were interested in receiving such information -- 85% compared to 80%. Of those responding negatively or not at all, there was a frequent comment that there was no viable, efficient way of doing so. Again, there appears to be a relationship between collection size and positive response to this possibility. Sixty-five percent of very small music libraries, 86% of small music libraries, 89% of medium music libraries, and 100% of large music libraries indicated they would be willing to share information. The current type of catalog seems to have a bearing on willingness to share. While 94% of card catalog users, 97% of computer catalog users, and 92% of "other" catalog users indicated interest in sharing information, only 67% of those using a notebook catalog did so.

Summary and Implications

From this data, a picture emerges of Roman Catholic cathedral music libraries. Based on statistical means, the average cathedral choir serves a diocese of 315,000 and a parish congregation of just under 2,000 members. Cathedral choirs range from eight members to more than 40. Roughly 30% of U.S. cathedrals pay all or some of their singers; the remaining 70% use all-volunteer forces. Fifty-nine percent of all cathedrals have one or more paid, fulltime music directors, who have been in their current position for an average of 8.2 years.

The average cathedral music library houses 35 copies each, of 325 titles, and has a total collection of 11,511 scores. It acquires 15 new titles annually, with a budget of $1,777. No cathedral pays a professional librarian to oversee the music library. Fifty-four percent of these libraries are run by music directors or their assistants, 4% by paid clerks, and 42% by volunteers. Fifteen percent of U.S. cathedrals have a specific room designated as the "music library." The remaining 85% store scores in the rehearsal room, director's office, in or near the performance space, or in other locations. Seventy percent gather sets of scores together in file folders, 50% use storage boxes, another 17% use other systems. Many cathedrals report using more than one system.

Twenty-seven percent of cathedral music libraries can be accessed through a card catalog; another twenty-seven percent through personal computers. At present, the preferred form of music library catalog is an alphabetical list of titles kept in a notebook--used by 56% of all cathedrals. No cathedral music library catalogs in MARC format, and only one (less than one percent) reports using Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2nd edition (AACR2). Twenty-eight percent maintain authority files. Cathedral music libraries are not classified using any standard, published classification system. Twelve percent of cathedral music libraries use in-house classification systems. Fifty-four percent file alphabetically by title or composer, or by accession number. The remaining collections are arranged within broad categories, such as by voicing, season or use, or form (motet, anthem, mass, etc.)

Cathedral music directors, the primary users of these collections, indicate the most useful access points to musical scores are by title, season (use), and by scripture reference--fifty percent of all music directors have developed their own title indexes and 37% have prepared season/use indexes. Interestingly, less than 15% of directors report using published indexes that provide this access.

From the picture that has emerged can be inferred some of the underlying motivations and inclinations of cathedral music directors, which have dictated up until now, and presumably will into the future, the nature of cathedral music

libraries. While a cathedral music collection may contain as few as twenty titles, or as many as 90,000 scores, the primary patron, the music director, is also the individual chiefly responsible for maintenance and oversight of the collection. In this way cathedral music libraries are not unlike the great personal libraries of bygone eras--collections lovingly assembled, with each new acquisition complementing the ones preceding it, and the entire collection contents well etched on the collector's mind.

Like personal libraries of old, as cathedral music collections change hands, and grow to proportions no longer conveniently maintained by one individual, many of the subtleties of the collection, formerly held only in the mind of the collector, are lost without the introduction of at least minimal levels of standardization, indexing, and authority control. From this study we can see that, when compared to "more typical" libraries, cathedral music libraries are small and modestly funded. Unlike a personal library, a cathedral music library acquires multiple copies of each title, and over time the entire collection is regularly passed on from patron to patron (from one music director to his or her successor).

As music directors recognize that cathedral music libraries are ever-growing collections of a somewhat more "public" nature, the future of these collections will be charted. It is clear from this study that music directors

have recognized the need for basic library procedures in their collections. Although less than 50% of cathedral music directors indicated their collections were cataloged or indexed, nearly 90% affirmed the value of such a catalog or index. Further, the data indicate that as the size of music collections increase, so too does the estimation of a catalog or index.

There is overwhelming support for, and an awareness of the value of information-sharing and networking among cathedral music directors. Among those with larger collections, 90% indicated an interest and willingness to share information with others. It would appear that the factors holding back progress in this direction are lack of resources, staff, and standards. Few music directors have the time to devote to authority control, typing catalog cards, or electronic data entry, nor the resources to pay for such expertise. Ultimately, however, it may be only inertia that prevents further action--a sense that improvements would be worthwhile, but there are higher priorities; that useful standardization and collaboration will become the task of a future custodian of the collection.

It appears that music directors have acknowledged a need. Perhaps the key to better organized and more easily accessed cathedral music libraries lies in the establishment of common goals, adherence to standards to facilitate infor-

mation sharing, and a commitment to investigate and begin an ongoing process of music library improvement.

Further Research

Because so little is known about church music libraries in general, there is considerable latitude in the areas that might be further investigated. It would be useful to study the broader spectrum of church music libraries, beyond the segment examined here. A replicated or parallel study to the present one could be undertaken using populations from organizations of much broader scope, such as the National Pastoral Musicians Association, Church Musicians Association, American Guild of Organists, and/or the American Choral Directors Association. Findings and perceptions from this wider population should offer needed insights to the larger church music library picture.

Survey results indicated there are several carefully cataloged cathedral music libraries. Case studies of these individual libraries would yield useful in-depth information, not obtainable through a survey, regarding the histories, methods, resources, personnel and policies that brought these collections to their present state.

Public, academic, and special libraries have already encountered and solved most of the problems church music libraries may face. Both historical and contemporary comparisons of the approach to the management of performance

libraries of choral scores would be worthwhile, to find where church music libraries can benefit from the experiences of other libraries and where they diverge.

Finally, with a goal of encouraging electronic networking, a worthwhile study might be the replication of Smiraglia and Papakhian's "Music in the OCLC Online Union Catalog" (1981), where, presumably because of member library collection policies, a paucity of printed choral literature was found in the database. It can be assumed that if "serious" choral literature is under-represented in the OCLC database, then the presence of the sub-group of sacred choral music will be even more severely limited. Such a study may suggest significant implications for church musicians.

Reference List

Anderson, Jacqulyn. How to Administer and Promote a Church Media Library. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press. 1984.

_____. How to Catalog Church Music Materials. Nashville, Tenn.: Convention Press. 1976.

Anderson, Jacqulyn, and Ham, Dick. Developing a Church Music Library. Nashville, Tenn.: Convention Press. 1982.

Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods, 2nd edition. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing. 1990.

Buth, Olga. "Scores and Recordings." Library Trends 23 (January 1975): 427-50.

Bradley, Carol June. American Music Librarianship. New York: Greenwood Press. 1990.

Brownstead, Frank, and McCollam, Pat. The Volunteer Choir. Washington, D.C.: The Pastoral Press. 1987.

Byrne, Frank P., Jr. A Practical Guide to the Music Library. Cleveland: Ludwig Music Publishing Co. 1987.

Clark, Chris, and Linehan, Andy. "Popular Music in British Libraries." Brio 24 (Summer 1987): 30-35.

Clegg, Susan M. "Music Libraries in Teaching Institutions." Fontis Artis Musicae, 25 (Juli-September 1978): 212-216.

Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, in The Liturgy Documents: A Parish Resource. Chicago, Ill.: Liturgy Training Publications. 1985.

Gauntlett, Henry J. The Musical World, XXXV, vol. 3, in Young, Percy M. "Music in English Cathedral Libraries." Fontis Artis Musicae, 36 (Oktober-Dezember 1989): 252-261.

Harvey, John F. (ed.). Church and Synagogue Libraries. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press. 1980.

Horner, John. Special Cataloging. London: Bingley. 1973.

Jebb, John. "The Choral Service of the United Church of England and Ireland..." in Young, Percy M. "Music in English Cathedral Libraries." Fontis Artis Musicae, 36 (Oktober-Dezember 1989): 252-261.

Johnson, Lawrence J. The Mystery of Faith: The Ministers of Music. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Pastoral Musicians. 1983.

Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR. Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. 2nd ed., 1988 Revision. Chicago: American Library Association. 1988.

Krummel, D. W. English Music Printing 1553-1700. London: The Bibliographical Society. 1975.

Laster, James. Catalogue of Choral Music Arranged in Biblical Order. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press. 1983.

Lawrence, Anthony. The Psalm Locator. San Jose, Calif.: Resource Publications. 1986.

Lawrence, Joy E., and Allison, Anne Marie. "Plug Into a Computer to Plan Your Repertory." Music Educators Journal 65 (December 1978): 38-43.

Levin, Richard I., and Rubin, David S. Applied Elementary Statistics. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. 1980.

Library of Congress. Cataloging Service Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: Cataloging Distribution Service. 1978-

Music Library Association. Music Cataloging Bulletin. Canton, Mass.: MLA. 1969-

Nordin, Dayton W. How to Organize and Direct the Church Choir. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing. 1973.

Redfern, Brian. Organising Music in Libraries, volume 1. London: Bingley. 1978.

Rice, William C. A Concise History of Church Music. New York: Abingdon Press. 1964.

Rodda, Dorothy, and Harvey, John. Directory of Church Libraries. [Philadelphia, Pa.]: Drexel Press. 1967.

Sadie, Stanley (ed.). The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians. London: MacMillan; Washington: Grove's Dictionaries of Music. 1980.

Sherbon, James W. "Chips and Diodes of Microcomputers." Music Educators Journal 69 (January 1983): 32-38.

Smiraglia, Richard. Cataloging Music: A Manual for Use with AACR2. 2nd ed. Lake Crystal, Minn.: Soldier Creek Press, 1986.

_____. Music Cataloging: The Bibliographic Control of Printed and Recorded Music in Libraries. Englewood, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, Inc. 1989.

_____. "Theoretical Considerations in the Bibliographic Control of Music Materials in Libraries." Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 5 (1985): 1-16.

Smiraglia, Richard, and Papakhian, Arsen R. "Music in the OCLC Online Union Catalog: A Review." Notes 38 (December 1981): 257-274.

Weiner, Theodore. "History of Religion, Education, and Libraries," in Harvey, John F. (ed.). Church and Synagogue Libraries. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press. 1980.

White, Joyce L. "The Demography of American Church and Synagogue Libraries," in Harvey, John F. (ed.). Church and Synagogue Libraries. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press. 1980.

Young, Percy M. "Music in English Cathedral Libraries." Fontis Artis Musicae, 36 (Oktober-Dezember 1989): 252-261.

Appendix A: Reference Sources Cited by Cathedral Music Directors

Lectionary - the book of prescribed scripture readings for each day of the year. Readings for Sunday liturgies are rotated on a three-year cycle; for daily services they rotate every other year.

Roman Gradual - a liturgical work, in Latin, containing the words and music of the Roman Mass.

The Psalm Locator - a listing of published choral music indexed according to the chapter and verse citations of the Book of Psalms.

Catalogue of Choral Music Arranged in Biblical Order - similar to the Psalm Locator, but much more extensive, providing citations to choral music by chapter and verse for the entire Bible.

Sacred Music in Print - a selection/acquisition tool. Like Books in Print, this is a compilation of publishers' catalogs to provide a comprehensive listing of sacred music currently available in print.

Other sources cited

Catalogue of Anthems & Motets for the Sunday Lectionary, Years A,B,C
Liber Usualis
Gregorian Missal
Antiphonale
Episcopal Choirmaster Handbook
American Guild of Organists Lectionary
Aids in Ministry
Today's Liturgy
The Rites
Liturgy Planning Guide

publishers' catalogs
hymnal indexes

Appendix B: Correspondence and Survey Instrument

School of Library and Information Science
Columbus Program
(614) 292-7746

Kent STATE UNIVERSITY

May 8, 1992

Dear Cathedral Musician:

Last summer I volunteered as music librarian for Saint Joseph Cathedral in Columbus, Ohio. With the patience and assistance of music director James Hecht, I inventoried the entire collection, and created a computer database which allowed us to develop several indexes and reference lists.

In the course of this project, as a graduate student of library science, I began wondering how other cathedrals control their music libraries. I am writing you now to request your help in completing requirements for the Master of Library Science degree from Kent State University. I am asking that you share some basic information about your cathedral music collection by completing the enclosed survey and returning it to me no later than June 5, 1992, in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. For the purposes of this study I am seeking information only for choral scores, not instrumental or soloist music.

Completing this survey should take you no more than 20 or 30 minutes, and for the "statistical" questions, your best estimates are sufficient. I have also enclosed a form for you to return if you would like a summary of the tabulated results.

The Kent State University Institutional Review Board requires that you be informed of the university's rules for research; please read the information on the reverse of this letter regarding your voluntary participation, and my assurance to you of confidentiality. Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Mark J. McGuire

Mark J. McGuire

124 Mount Hall, 1050 Carmack Road
Columbus, OH 43210

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF CATHEDRAL MUSIC LIBRARIES

The purpose of this study is to assess current practices regarding Roman Catholic cathedral music libraries. The study seeks to reveal basic statistical information, as well as methods used to organize and retrieve choral scores.

Your responses to this survey will remain strictly confidential. The return envelope has been coded solely to monitor returns--immediately upon receipt the coded envelope will be separated from your completed survey and discarded.

There are no apparent risks from participation in this study. Regardless, your participation is entirely voluntary. There is no penalty if you choose not to participate, or should you withdraw from the study at any time.

For further information about this study, contact:

Mark McGuire, Principal (graduate student) researcher (614) 487-0547
or Dr. Mary Kim, Faculty Advisor (614) 292-0547

If you have questions about Kent State University's rules for research, please contact:

Dr. Adriaan de Vries (216) 672-2070

Saint Joseph Cathedral
212 EAST BROAD STREET
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215

May 11, 1992

Dear friends,

I would ask that you give Mark every consideration.

He has done very fine work here at St. Joseph Cathedral organizing the library-a task that I'm sure none of us enjoy.

Hopefully, once this project is complete, the information can be shared to help all of us create simple and efficient methods to handle our extensive music libraries.

Best wishes,

Jim Hecker

Answer each of the following questions as accurately as possible. For the purposes of this survey, information is requested for choral scores only; do not include insturmental or soloist music, or information regarding sound recordings.

1. What is the estimated population of the diocese served by your cathedral?_____

2. What is the estimated population of your cathedral parish?_____

3. How large is your cathedral choir?

   - ☐ fewer than 10 members
   - ☐ 11-25 members
   - ☐ 26-40 members
   - ☐ more than 40 members

4. How many of your singers are paid?

   - ☐ all of them
   - ☐ none of them
   - ☐ one solist/section leader for each part (SATB)
   - ☐ other (please specify) _____

5. How long have you been music director at this cathedral? _____

For the following eight questions, your best estimate is sufficient, if precise counts are unavailable.

6. During an "average" September-May season, how many choir rehearsals do you conduct each week?

   - ☐ less than 1 per week
   - ☐ 1 each week
   - ☐ 2 each week
   - ☐ more than 2 each week

7. How many music titles are rehearsed at a typical rehearsal? _____

8. During an "average" September-May season, how many performances do you conduct each week?

   _____

9. Excluding congregational hymns and responses, how many music titles (anthems, motets, mass settings, other part-songs) are performed at a typical mass/service?

   _____

10. What is the current number of music titles in your cathedral choir music collection?

    _____

12. What is the total number of individual scores in your collection? (You may wish to simply multiply the number of titles by the average number of copies of any one title.)

_____

13. What is your annual budget for new music acquisitions? _____

14. On average, how many new titles do you purchase each year? (Please provide the number of titles, not the total number of copies of each title.)

_____

15. Who takes care of basic "library" functions for your music collection (inventory, filing, etc.)? (please check only one)

- ☐ director
- ☐ assistant director
- ☐ paid non-professional (student, clerk, etc.)
- ☐ paid professional librarian
- ☐ unpaid volunteer(s) with no library training
- ☐ unpaid volunteer(s) with library training

16. How are your choral scores stored? (check all that apply)

- ☐ boxes on shelves or in cabinets
- ☐ file folders in filing cabinets
- ☐ envelopes
- ☐ expanding files/wallets
- ☐ other (please specify) _____

17. Where is the music library located?

- ☐ in the rehearsal room
- ☐ in the director's office
- ☐ in a separate room used only for this purpose
- ☐ in another building apart from the church
- ☐ adjacent to the performance space (choir loft, choir stalls, etc.)
- ☐ other (please specify) _____

18. How do you "keep track" of your music collection? (check all that apply)

- ☐ card file
- ☐ list of titles in notebook
- ☐ computer database (please specify software) _____
- ☐ none of the above

19. If you have some form of written or automated file, do you use either of the following? (check any that apply)

- ☐ Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2nd edition (AACR2)
- ☐ Machine-readable cataloging (MARC) format
- ☐ none of the above

20. If you have a written or automated file, do you keep a record of preferred spellings and forms of names and/or titles to assure consistency?

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no

20. Is your music collection arranged by any of the following systems? (check any that apply)

- ☐ Library of Congress Classification
- ☐ Dewey Decimal Classification
- ☐ other published system (please specify) _____
- ☐ written system developed for this collection
- ☐ arranged or grouped by voicing (SSA, SATB, etc.)
- ☐ arranged or grouped by use (general, Easter, patriotic, etc.)
- ☐ none of the above

21. If your music is not arranged by any of the above systems, how do you arrange it?

- ☐ file alphabetically by title
- ☐ file alphabetically by composer
- ☐ file in order of purchase (each new title is assigned a consecutive filing number)
- ☐ other (please specify) _____

22. Have you developed any in-house "finding aids" or reference tools to help you locate a music title by any of the following? (check any that apply)

- ☐ title
- ☐ composer
- ☐ editor/arranger
- ☐ first line of text
- ☐ publisher
- ☐ publisher number
- ☐ scripture reference
- ☐ liturgical use/cycle/season
- ☐ voicing
- ☐ past performance record
- ☐ other (please specify) _____

23. How useful would it be to you to be able to locate scores in your music collection by any of the following? (Please rate each heading on the 5-point scale--circle your responses)

	not that useful		moderately useful		very useful
title	1	2	3	4	5
composer	1	2	3	4	5
editor/arranger	1	2	3	4	5
first line of text	1	2	3	4	5
publisher	1	2	3	4	5
publisher number	1	2	3	4	5
scripture reference	1	2	3	4	5
liturgy/cycle/season	1	2	3	4	5
voicing	1	2	3	4	5
past performance record	1	2	3	4	5
other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5

24. Which of the following printed sources do you use? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Lectionary
- ☐ Roman Gradual
- ☐ Catalogue of Choral Music Arranged in Biblical Order
- ☐ The Psalm Locator
- ☐ Sacred Music in Print
- ☐ other (please specify) _____

25. Which of the following printed sources do you use? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Lectionary
- ☐ Roman Gradual
- ☐ Catalogue of Choral Music Arranged in Biblical Order
- ☐ The Psalm Locator
- ☐ Sacred Music in Print
- ☐ other (please specify) _____

26. Would it be useful to you to have an index, "card catalog," or computer database of your cathedral music collection?

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no

27. Would you want assistance in developing such an index, catalog, or database?

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no

28. Would you be interested in knowing about the holdings of other cathedral music collections?

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no

29. Would you be willing to share information about your music collection (*not the actual scores*) with other cathedral musicians?

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no

Thank you again, for your participation in this study. Please return your completed survey by June 5, 1992, to:

Mark McGuire
Fort Hayes Education Center
546 Jack Gibbs Boulevard
Columbus, OH 43215

If you would like summary results from this survey, please provide your name and address below:

_____
Name

_____
Title

_____
Address

_____

_____
City, State, Zip

School of Library and Information Science
Columbus Program
(614) 292-7746

Kent STATE UNIVERSITY

July 8, 1992

Dear Cathedral Musician:

Last month I wrote to you requesting your responses to a survey concerning the music program and music collection at your cathedral, for research I am conducting toward a Master of Library Science degree from Kent State University.

In order to make this study more "statistically valid" and more useful to the church at large, I am seeking to increase the response rate. (Thus far, 98 of the 185 U.S. cathedrals have responded.) To that end, I am asking that you take a moment to read the enclosed postage-paid card, select the response(s) that best describe your situation, and drop it in the mail by July 20, 1992. In the event you wish to complete the survey, I have enclosed another copy for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Mark J. McGuire

Mark J. McGuire

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF CATHEDRAL MUSIC LIBRARIES

Select as many responses as are appropriate. Please return this card by July 20, 1992.

- ☐ There is no director of music at this cathedral
- ☐ There is no regularly organized choir at this cathedral
- ☐ There is no organized library of music at this cathedral
- ☐ We received your earlier survey, but found it inappropriate to our situation
- ☐ It is our practice to not participate in studies such as this
- ☐ Other: